



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,353	07/26/2006	Kunihiko Horikawa	8048-1152	5720

466 7590 10/16/2009
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

CHU, KIM KWOK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/16/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/574,353

Applicant(s)

HORIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Kim-Kwok CHU

Art Unit

2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed on 8/3/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2627

Continued Examination after Final Rejection

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 3, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 5-13, 16, 17 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding Claim 5, the amended "correcting device" is not defined or taught in the specification.

Similarly, in each of Claims 7, 16, 17, 20-23, the amended "correcting device" is not defined or taught in the specification.

The claims not specifically mentioned above are rejected because these claims are dependent on the rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the recording medium recited in the preamble and the amended feature "performing running OPC which is performed in parallel with the recording of the record information" recited in the body of the claim lacks any association/correlation that renders the claim language as a whole unclear and confusing. In other words, the claimed OPC

Art Unit: 2627

operation should be performed by an OPC means instead of the recording medium.

The claims not specifically mentioned above are rejected because these claims are dependent on the rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

7. Claims 1-11 and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyata (U.S. Patent 6,052,347).

8. Miyata teaches an information recording medium having all of the elements and means as recited in claims 1-4. For example, Miyata teaches the following:

Regarding Claim 1, the information recording medium 1 (Fig. 11) comprising: a recording area 13 (Fig. 6; column 6, lines 13 and 14) to record therein record information (data) by irradiating laser light thereto (Fig. 11; data is recorded in zone 1, zone 2 etc; Fig. 5); and a recording control area 11, 15

Art Unit: 2627

(Fig. 6) to record therein control information (OPC) for correction-controlling a laser power in accordance with a recording position (zone 1, zone 2, zone 3 etc.) in the recording area 13 (Fig. 6; column 6, lines 10-17; each OPC is respective to its recording zone), the control information being obtained by performing running OPC (optimum power calibration) which is performed in parallel (Fig. 12; compare and adjusted) with the recording of the record information (Fig. 13; step 69; optimum power determination).

Regarding Claim 2, the control information (OPC) indicates an association between information which represents the recording position (zone) in the recording area 13 and information which represents recording sensitivity (radius with respect to laser power) in the recording position (column 6, lines 18-30).

Regarding Claim 3, the control information (OPC) indicates an association between information which represents the recording position (radius) in the recording area (zone) and information which represents an optimum laser power in the recording position (Figs. 5, 12 and 13; step 69).

Regarding Claim 4, the control information (OPC) indicates a correlation relationship (Fig. 14) between the recording position (radius) in the recording area (zone) and an optimum

Art Unit: 2627

laser power in the recording position (Figs. 12 and 13; step 69).

9. Miyata teaches an information recording apparatus having all of the elements and means as recited in claims 5, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20 and 22. For example, Miyata teaches the following:

Regarding Claim 5, the information recording apparatus comprising: a recording device 31 (Fig. 11) for recording record information by irradiating laser light onto an information recording medium 1 comprising: a recording area 13 (Fig. 6; column 6, lines 13 and 14) to record therein record information by irradiating laser light thereto; and a recording control area 11, 15 (Fig. 6) to record therein control information for correction-controlling a laser power in accordance with a recording position in the recording area 13 (Fig. 6); a correcting device 47 (Fig. 12) for correcting the control information recorded in said recording control area of the information recording medium, on the basis of a result of running OPC (Optimum Power Calibration) which is performed in parallel (Fig. 12; compare and adjusted) with the recording of the record information; and an optimizing device 45 (Fig. 12) for optimizing a laser power, on the basis of at least one of the control information recorded in the recording control area

Art Unit: 2627

of the information recording medium and the control information corrected by the correcting device.

Regarding Claim 6, the optimizing device 39 roughly estimates the control information (OPC) at a recording position (radius) for which the corresponding control information does not exist, on the basis of the control information recorded in the recording control area (Fig. 5).

10. Method claim 14 is drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claim 5. Therefore method claim 14 corresponds to apparatus claim 5 and is rejected for the same reason of anticipation as used above

11. Claim 16 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection, and is met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 16 however also recites the following limitation which are also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Regarding Claim 16, a reproducing device 35 (read/write head) for reproducing the record information recorded on the information recording medium 1 (Figs. 11 and 12).

Art Unit: 2627

12. Claim 18 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection, and is met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 18 however also recites the following limitation which are also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Regarding Claim 18, a reproducing process for reproducing the record information recorded on the information recording medium 1 (Figs. 11 and 12).

13. Claim 20 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection, and is met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 20 however also recites the following limitation which are also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Regarding Claim 20, a computer program for record control to control a computer provided for the information recording apparatus to make the computer function as at least one portion of said recording device and the optimizing device (column 9; lines 34-40; software coding).

14. Claim 22 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection, and is met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 22 however also recites the following limitation which are also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding Claim 22, a computer program for record/reproducing control to control a computer provided for the information recording/reproducing apparatus, the computer program making the computer function as at least one portion of the information recording apparatus and the reproducing device(column 9; lines 34-40; software coding).

15. Miyata teaches an information recording medium having all of the elements and means as recited in claims 7-11, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23. For example, Miyata teaches the following:

Regarding Claim 7, an information recording apparatus comprising: a first recording device 35 (Fig. 11; read/write head) for irradiating laser light onto an information recording medium 1 and for recording record information (data) onto the information recording medium 1 (Fig. 6; area 13 is the data area); a control information generating device 39 (Fig. 12; column 8, lines 40-51) for obtaining an optimum laser power according to a recording position of the information recording medium 1 and for generating control information (OPC recorded in 11 and 15) which indicates an association between information which represents the recording position and information which represents the optimum laser power (Figs. 12 and 13);

Art Unit: 2627

a correcting device 47 (Fig. 12) for correcting the control information generated by the control information generating device 39, on the basis of a result of running OPC (Optimum Power Calibration) (Fig. 14; recording power is linearly corrected/calculated according to data zones/radius) which is preformed in parallel with the recording of the record information (Fig. 12; compare and adjusted); a second recording device 35 (Fig. 11; read/write head) for recording the control information generated by the control information generating device 39 and the control information corrected by the correcting device 47 (Figs. 12 and 14); and a controlling device 43 for controlling a laser power of the laser light irradiated onto the information recording medium 1, on the basis of the control information (OPC information) recorded by the second recording device (Figs. 12 and 13).

Regarding Claim 8, the second recording device 35 records the control information (OPC) generated by the control information generating device 39, onto the information recording medium 1 (Fig. 6).

Regarding Claim 9, the control information generating device 39 generates the control information (OPC), on the basis of a calibration value of a laser power obtained by performing running OPC (Optimum Recording Calibration) (Fig. 13).

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding Claim 10, the control information generating device 39 generates the control information (OPC) corresponding to each predetermined area (radius/zone) of the information recording medium 1 (Figs. 5 and 7).

Regarding Claim 11, the control information generating device 39 generates the control information (OPC) corresponding to a recording linear velocity of the information recording medium 1 (Fig. 10).

16. Method claim 15 is drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claim 7. Therefore method Claim 15 corresponds to apparatus claim 7 and is rejected for the same reason of anticipation as used above.

17. Claim 17 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection, and is met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 17 however also recites the following limitation which is also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Regarding Claim 17, a reproducing device 35 (Figs. 11) for reproducing the record information recorded on the information recording medium 1 (Figs. 11 and 12).

Art Unit: 2627

18. Method claim 19 is drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claim 7. Therefore method claim 19 corresponds to apparatus claim 7 and is rejected for the same reason of anticipation as used above. Claim 19 however also recites the following limitation which is also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Regarding Claim 19, a reproducing process (read) for reproducing the record information recorded on the information recording medium 1 (Figs. 11 and 12).

19. Claim 21 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection, and is met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 21 however also recites the following limitation which is also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Regarding Claim 21, a computer program for record control to control a computer provided for the information recording apparatus, the computer program making the computer function as at least one portion of the recording device, the control information generating device, the second recording device, and the controlling device (column 9, lines 34-40).

Art Unit: 2627

20. Claim 23 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection, and is met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 23 however also recites the following limitation which is also taught in the prior art of Miyata:

Regarding Claim 23, a computer program for record control to control a computer provided for the information recording apparatus, the computer program making the computer function as at least one portion of the recording device, the control information generating device, the second recording device, and the controlling device (column 9, lines 34-40) and a reproducing device 35 (Figs. 11) for reproducing the record information recorded on the information recording medium 1 (Figs. 11 and 12).

Art Unit: 2627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Miyata (U.S. Patent 6,052,347) in view of Ito et al. (U.S. Publication US2003/0137909).

Miyata teaches optimum power control for recording/reproducing a recording medium very similar to that of the present invention. However, Miyata does not teach the following:

with respect to Claim 12, the information recording medium comprises a plurality of recording layers, and the controlling device controls the laser power irradiated to another recording layer, on the basis of the control information obtained in one recording layer, in a case in which a target, to which the recording device performs recording operation, is changed from the one recording layer to the another recording layer out of the plurality of recording layers.

Art Unit: 2627

with respect to Claim 13, the information recording medium comprises a plurality of recording layers, and said control information generating device generates the control information in another recording layer, on the basis of the control information obtained in one recording layer, in a case in which a target, to which the recording device performs recording operation, is changed from the one recording layer to the another recording layer out of the plurality of recording layers.

Ito teaches the following:

an information recording medium 50 (Fig. 6) comprises a plurality of recording layers 51 and 52, and the controlling device 514 (Fig. 18) controls the laser power irradiated to another recording layer, on the basis of the control information (OPC stored in medium region 11) obtained in one recording layer, in a case in which a target, to which the recording device performs recording operation (Fig. 18), is changed from the one recording layer to the another recording layer out of the plurality of recording layers (Fig. 6; each layer has its OPC information 11).

an information recording medium 50 (Fig. 6) comprises a plurality of recording layers 51 and 52, and the control information generating device generates the control information

Art Unit: 2627

(OPC stored in medium region 11) in another recording layer, on the basis of the control information obtained in one recording layer, in a case in which a target, to which the recording device performs recording operation (Fig. 18), is changed from the one recording layer to the another recording layer out of the plurality of recording layers (Fig. 6; each layer has its OPC information 11).

Although Miyata does not teach that the optimum power control is used on a multi-layer recording medium, for increasing the storage capacity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a two layers recording medium such as Ito's as Miyata's recording medium, and furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store OPC information in a recording medium such as Miyata's in each recording layer of Ito's two layered recording medium, because each recording layer has its OPC information corresponding to its information position/radius.

Art Unit: 2627

Response to Remarks

23. Applicant's RCE and Remarks filed on August 3, 2009 have been fully considered.

With respect to the amended feature "performed in parallel with the recording of the record information" in all Claims, it is also taught in the prior art of Miyata (U.S. Patent 6,052,347) as the recording of test data and the optimizing it are in a single (parallel) operation. In other words, the claimed parallel operation is not a simultaneous write and test/calibration operation which at least two read/write heads are required.

Art Unit: 2627

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kim CHU whose telephone number is (571) 272-7585 between 9:30 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Nguyen, can be reached on (571) 272-7579.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished application is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9191 (toll free).

/Kim-Kwok CHU/
Examiner AU2627
October 12, 2009
(571) 272-7585

/Peter Vincent Agustin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627